

### REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Fourteen new dependent claims have been added.

**Claims 1-6, 11, 13, 14, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

**In claim 1, sixth paragraph, wherein the sentence starts "enabling one of...", it is not clear what one of the display units communicates the stored identifications of people within the social network of the first wearer to. For examining purposes, it is presumed that the display automatically communicate the stored identification of people that were within the social network of the first wearer to the display unit of worn by the second wearer.**

**In claim 21, in the paragraph starting with the number (1) it is not clear what is intended to be read. Is it supposed to be read "an identification OF the second person". For examining purpose, it is so presumed.**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "enabling the display unit of a first wearer to automatically communicate to a display unit of a second wearer the stored identifications of people who were within the social network of the first wearer".

Claim 21 has been amended to recite "add, to the stored identifications, an identification of the second person as being within the first person's social network".

**Claims 1-6, 11, 13, 14, and 21 -30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.**

The applicant acknowledges that the claims would be patentable.

*A fourth supplemental information disclosure statement with Form PTO-1449 had been filed in the above-captioned patent application on November 29, 2006. Applicants have not yet received the examiner's copy of the Form PTO-1449, initialed to acknowledge that the examiner has considered the disclosed information. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner initial and return a copy of this submitted Form PTO-1449.*

Applicant : Richard D. Borovoy and George A.  
Eberstadt  
Serial No. : 10/729,696  
Filed : December 5, 2003  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18601-003002

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims, or (d) has removed language from a claim indicates that a related feature has been deliberately expressed more broadly than previously expressed and may require additional searching by the examiner.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 18601-003002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/18/8



David L. Feigenbaum  
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin St  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906